LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT. U. S.

Office - Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 27 1958
JOHN T. FEY, Clerk

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1957

No. 815...

In the Matter

of the

Petition of SKIBS A/S JOLUND, as owner of the M/S BLACK GULL for exoneration from or limitation of liability.

SKIBS A/S JOLUND,

Petitioner,

vs.

AMERICAN SMELTING & REFINING COMPANY, ATKINSON HASERICK & CO., et al.,

Respondents,

MARIA VERBEECK, et al.,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

WARNER PYNE,
DUDLEY C. SMITH,
Counsel for Petitioner,
116 John Street,
New York City.

INDEX

	PAGE
Petition	1
Opinions Below	2
Jurisdiction	2
Questions Presented	2
Statutes Involved	3
Statement	3
Argument:	
I—The decision of the Court of Appeals should be reversed by this Court because it nullifies the effect of the United States Statutes relating to fires at sea, and is irreconcilable with the decisions of this Court dealing with those statutes	5
II—The Court of Appeals erroneously holds that liability can be found against the carriers on grounds which violate the established legal rules for determining negligence	14
Conclusion	21

Authorities

The Fire Statute—46 U.S.C. Sec. 182	3
Carriage of Goods by Sea Act—46 U.S.C. Sec. 1304	3
The Automobile Insurance Co. et al., v. *United Fruit Company*, 224 F. 2d 72	8
The Cabo Hatteras, 5 F. Supp. 725	11, 15
Consumers Import Co. Inc. et al., v. *Kabushiki Kaisha Kawasaki Zosenjo, et al.*, 320 U.S. 249	6
Earle & Stoddart, Inc. et al., v. *Ellerman's Wilson Line, Ltd.*, 287 U.S. 420	5

PAGE

Hoskyn & Co., Inc. et al. v. *Silver Line Ltd.*, 143 F. 2d 462 11

Petition of Isbrandtsen Company, 201 F. 2d 281..... 11

Roberts v. *United Fisheries Vessels Co.* 141 F. 2d 288 14

The Strathdon, 101 Fed. 600..... 6

Appendix

Opinion of the District Court..... 1a

Opinion of the Court of Appeals..... 11a

Opinion of the Court of Appeals on Petitions for Rehearing 30a

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1957

No. .....

In the Matter

of the

Petition of SKIBS A/S JOLUND, as owner of the M/S BLACK GULL for exoneration from or limitation of liability.

SKIBS A/S JOLUND,

Petitioner,

vs.

AMERICAN SMELTING & REFINING COMPANY, ATKINSON HASERICK & CO., *et al.*,

Respondents,

MARIA VERBEECK, *et al.*,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Skibs A/S Jolund, a Norwegian corporation and owner of the former motor vessel BLACK GULL, prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review a judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit which reversed a decree of the District Court for the Southern

District of New York, in admiralty, which granted petitioner's petition for exoneration from liability for all claims arising out of a fire which occurred on the BLACK GULL on July 18, 1952; and the order of the Court of Appeals which denied Skibs A/S Jolund's petition for a rehearing.

The respondents above named who filed claims in petitioner's limitation proceeding asserted the same claims in separate suits on libels filed against Black Diamond Steamship Corp., which was the time-charterer of the BLACK GULL at the time of the fire. Petitioner's limitation proceeding and the libels against Black Diamond were joined for trial in the District Court, and argued simultaneously on appeal. The District Court entered a decree dismissing the libels against Black Diamond, and the Court of Appeals reversed that decree. Black Diamond has filed in this Court a petition for writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the Court of Appeals.

The opinion of the District Court for the Southern District of New York is reported in 144 Fed. Supp. 47. The opinions of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit have not yet been officially reported. These opinions are printed in the Appendix to this petition for writ of certiorari.

The decree of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was entered on November 29, 1957. A petition for rehearing in that court was denied on January 16, 1958.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 United States Code, Section 1254(1).

Questions Presented

1. Where a shipowner has invoked the defense of the Fire Statute (46 U.S.C. Sec. 182) against claims for cargo loss and damage resulting from a fire aboard ship at sea,

and after a full trial cargo claimants have failed to prove the cause of the fire, may the Court of Appeals reverse a decree of the trial court dismissing all claims on the ground that it disagreed with some of the trial court's findings of fact as to *possible* causes of fire, without holding that the cause of the fire had been established?

2. Is the standard of due care in the stowage of cargo in sea transportation to be fixed by the long continued practice and opinion of men engaged in the business that napthalene should be shipped on deck uncovered, or may an Appellate Court substitute for such standard its own view unsupported by any proof that it may have been negligent not to cover the napthalene from the sun?

Statutes Involved

The Fire Statute, 46 U.S.C. Sec. 182—"Loss by Fire. No owner of any vessel shall be liable to answer for or make good to any person any loss or damage, which may happen to any merchandise whatsoever, which shall be shipped, taken in, or put on board any such vessel, by reason or by means of any fire happening to or on board the vessel, unless such fire is caused by the design or neglect of such owner." (R.S. Sec. 4282).

Carriage of Goods by Sea Act, 46 U.S.C. Sec. 1304 (2). "Neither the carrier nor the ship shall be responsible for loss or damage arising or resulting from * * * * (b) Fire, unless caused by the actual fault or privity of the carrier."

Statement

The Norwegian flag motor vessel BLACK GULL was owned by petitioner Skibs A/S Jolund, a Norwegian corporation, and was under long term time charter to Black Diamond Steamship Corp., employed by charterer in regular line

service between European and North Atlantic United States ports. In July 1952 she was loaded by charterer's representatives at Bremen, Hamburg, Rotterdam and Antwerp, including a deck load of about 550 tons of crude napthalene in used bags. These bags were stowed uncovered on the weather deck of the vessel in accordance with long established practice. At Antwerp, on completion of the loading there, the vessel obtained a certificate approving her loading and stowage from the official appointed by the Belgium Court of Commerce. She sailed from Rotterdam for New York on July 10. Nothing out of the ordinary occurred on the voyage until 11:10 P.M., July 18, when she was 50-60 miles off Nantucket, at which time fire was discovered in the deck stow of napthalene bags. The fire was found to have originated between the second and third tiers of bags abreast the No. 4 hatch, and the cause of the fire was not determined. Officers and crew got water on deck and fought the fire for 4½ hours, when it was necessary to abandon the ship. The nine passengers and all of the crew of forty were brought off safely in the boats, with the exception of four crew members who were missing and apparently lost their lives in fighting the fire. The ship and practically all the cargo were totally lost.

The vessel owner Jolund filed in the United States District Court for Southern District of New York, a petition for exoneration from or limitation of liability pursuant to United States laws (46 U.S.C. Sec. 183). Claims were filed in this proceeding by representatives of Verbeeck, a crew member who lost his life, by passengers for alleged personal injuries, and by various cargo owners in amounts totaling some $3,000,000. Identical claims were filed in separate suits on libels against Black Diamond Steamship Corp., the charterer of the vessel. The limitation proceeding and the libels against Black Diamond were consolidated for trial, which took place before Hon. Edward J. Dimock, commencing February 6th and ending on February 28th, 1956. On November 27th, 1956, the trial court entered its decree

granting the petition of Jolund for exoneration from liability and dismissing all claims filed in the limitation proceedings. Claimants appealed, and on November 29th, 1957, the Circuit Court of Appeals entered an order reversing the District Court's decision and remanding the case to the District Court for further proceedings.

REFERENCES

AA — Cargo Claimants Libellants-Appellants' Appendix in the Court of Appeals.

PA — Petitioner-Appellee Jolund's Appendix in the Court of Appeals.

RA — Respondent-Appellee Black Diamond's Appendix in the Court of Appeals.

R — The type-written trial record.

Argument

I

The decision of the Court of Appeals should be reversed by this court because it nullifies the effect of the United States statutes relating to fires at sea, and is irreconcilable with the decisions of this Court dealing with those statutes.

Since 1851 the Fire Statute, 46 U.S.C. Sec. 182, has afforded complete immunity to shipowners against claims for cargo loss and damage due to fire aboard ship where the cause of the fire is not established. This Court in the leading case of *Earle & Stoddard, Inc., et al.*, v. *Ellerman's Wilson Line, Ltd.*, 287 U.S. 420, said at page 425:

> "The fire statute, in terms, relieves the owners from liability 'unless such fire is caused by the design or neglect of such owner'. The statute makes no other exception from the complete immunity granted."

In *Consumers Import Co., Inc., et al.*, v. *Kabushiki Kaisha Kawasaki Zosenjo, et al.*, 320 U.S. 249, this Court discussed the history and purposes of the Fire Statute and said at page 255:

> "The purpose of the statute to relieve carriage rates of the [fire] insurance burden would be largely defeated if we were to adopt an interpretation which would enable cargo claimants and their subrogees to shift to the ship the risk of which Congress relieved the owner."

By Sec. 4 (2) (b) of the Carriage of Goods by Sea Act, (1936) 46 U.S.C. Sec. 1304, the same exemption is given all carriers of cargo shipped under bills of lading in foreign trade.

These statutes were adopted as necessary to the operation of the shipping industry by relieving ocean carriers of the tremendous risk of liability for fire losses at sea unless caused by the carriers' personal design or neglect. Similar laws have been adopted by all maritime nations. They represent a vital principle of maritime law, which recognizes that fire on ship board can and does break out from causes that can not be established. The history of sea voyages is full of unexplained fires. The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit said in *The Strathdon*, 101 Fed. 600 at page 606—"The occult causes of fire are as numerous as they are mysterious."

The fire in this case broke out in a deck stow of crude naphthalene packed in used bags at 11:10 P.M., July 18, 1952, when the BLACK GULL was in the North Atlantic, 50-60 miles off Nantucket, bound from European ports for New York. In accordance with approved practice, the bags were stowed uncovered on the main or weather deck of the vessel in tiers about six bags high, and the fire was first found in the second or third tier from the top abreast

the No. 4 hatch. The only charge of negligence asserted by claimants at the trial was failure to cover the stow of bags with tarpaulins.

In a thirteen day trial the trial judge heard the testimony in open court of sixteen witnesses, including all the vessel's deck officers, her chief engineer, the Black Diamond superintendent and the stevedore superintendent who loaded the naphthalene at Antwerp and Rotterdam, as well as witnesses from other steamship lines experienced in handling naphthalene cargoes. Two expert chemists testified—Dr. Snell, called by claimants, and Dr. Purdy, called by respondent. Seventy some exhibits were received in evidence.

The trial judge duly filed his opinion, and his Conclusion of Law, No. 5—"The proximate cause of the fire aboard the M. V. BLACK GULL has not been established." He then as required by the Statutes referred to and in accordance with the decisions of this Court dismissed all claims.

In his trial brief counsel for passenger claimants stated —"The cause of the fire remains unknown." Indeed, it is not possible to read the record of this trial and find that the cause of the fire has been established. The Court of Appeals does not so find. Nevertheless, it has reversed the trial court, not because the conclusion that the cause of the fire had not been established was clearly erroneous, but because it disagreed with some of the trial court's findings of fact as to various *possible* causes of fire.

The trial record includes testimony, discussions and arguments relating to three possible causes of the fire: (1) outside ignition, as by spark, lighted cigarette, etc.; (2) spontaneous combustion in the bagging, a possibility established by the testimony of the distinguished chemist Dr. Purdy, based on actual tests made by him (A.A. 370); (3) spontaneous combustion resulting from impurities in the

naphthalene itself.[1] In the opinion of the Court of Appeals there was another possibility—heat from rays of the sun raising the temperature of the naphthalene to a point where it would ignite, although this possibility is not supported by any testimony, and is denied by the experts who testified, (Purdy R.A. 164a; Aeby, A.A. 265a)[2].

The trial court in its opinion cites *The Automobile Insurance Co. et al.* v. *United Fruit Company,* (The Shell Bar) 224 F.2d 72, (Certiorari denied, 350 U.S. 885) decided by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in 1955, which case lays down the standard of proof required as to the cause of a fire. In that case drums of bleaching powder, marked "strong oxidizing agent—contact with combustible material may cause fire", were loaded in a hold with other cargo which was readily ignitable. After the fire, the drums which had contained the bleaching powder were found to have corroded through the seams and opened up from internal pressure, and the contents of the drums were missing. Counsel for libellant argued that since there was no other cargo in the hold which presented danger of spontaneous combustion, and since there was no possibility of any external agency having caused the fire, the burden of proof under the Fire Statute had been sustained. This contention was rejected by the Court, which said (page 74):

> "The question here is not whether the evidence would *support an inference* that spontaneous com-

---

[1] Dr. Purdy testified:

> "There is a possibility that you might have impurities in crude naphthalene which would be subject to self-heating". (A.A. 369a)

The Chemical Advisor to the Labour Inspector of the Dutch Shipping Inspector at Rotterdam said:

> "A third possibility is that of impure naphthalene containing substances liable to self-heating". (Pet. Exhibit W. A.A. 488a)

Neither the trial nor the appellate court comments on this testimony, but this possible cause of fire remains in the case.

[2] The court does not explain how the rays of the sun could have been the cause of a fire which occurred at 11.10 P.M., some 4 hours after sunset.

bustion within the drums and the resulting leakage of the contents and resulting oxidation upon coming in contact with combustible material had caused the fire. *The question is whether the proof compelled such an inference.* Cases such as *Standard Oil Co.* v. *R. L. Pitcher Co.*, 1 Cir., 1923, 289 F. 678 and the *Edmund Fanning*, 2 Cir., 1953, 201 F. 2d 281, cited by libellants, do not sustain their argument." (Italics ours)

In the instant case, the trial court in his opinion discusses two possible causes of the fire—spontaneous combustion in the bagging and outside ignition. After considering the evidence, he concluded that neither had been established as the cause of the fire—that he was not compelled by the proof to infer that either was the cause. He then went further, and held that claimants had failed to establish their contention (and only charge of negligence against the carrier) that the fire would have been prevented if the stow of bags had been covered with tarpaulins.

In the instant case, the Court of Appeals does not hold that the proof compels an inference as to the cause of the fire. The Court of Appeals does not hold that the proof compels an inference that the use of tarpaulins would have prevented the fire. By its own rule of *The Shell Bar* case (supra) it should therefore have affirmed the dismissal of all claims. Instead, the Court of Appeals reverses and remands for further proceedings because it finds itself in disagreement with the trail court on two questions of fact.

First, the trial court found on the basis of the testimony of two expert witnesses, Dr. Aeby (A.A. 265a) and Dr. Purdy (R.A. 166a)[1] (the only witnesses questioned on the point) that the sun's rays could not have been a cause of the fire. (Finding of Fact No. 29; A.A. 527a). The Court of Appeals does not refer to the testimony of Dr. Purdy,

[1] Dr. Purdy said:

"I don't think that there would be any possibility of the sun's rays causing the fire or raising the temperature to the point where it would ignite."

but questions the testimony of Dr. Aeby on the ground that he may have misunderstood the evidence as to the temperature of the stow at the time of the fire.

Second, the trial court found on the testimony of three witnesses (Capt. Andersen, A.A. 319a; Capt. Lohse, R.p. 1078; Capt. Hollaar, R. A. 73a) and the statements in Claimant's Exhibit 38, that tarpaulins could become impregnated with oil and gases from the stow so as to be as inflammable as the bags themselves (Findings of Fact No. 32, 33; A.A. 528a). He also found on the basis of the testimony of three witnesses (Capt. Lohse, R.A. 43a; Capt. Harris, R.A. 98a; Dr. Snell, R.A. 178a)[2], including claimant's own expert chemist, that tarpaulins themselves are not flame-proof, and would therefore not have prevented outside ignition (Finding of Fact No. 30, A.A. 528a). The Court of Appeals does not even mention the definite testimony that tarpaulins themselves are inflammable, but disagrees with the trial court that they might become impregnated with gases from the stow.

It should be noted that these disagreements of the Court of Appeals with the District Court do not go to the real issue in the case, namely, have claimants established the cause of the fire? Substituting the indicated findings of the Court of Appeals for those of the trial court, we have only additional possibilities, not proofs. Nevertheless, the Court of Appeals on these disagreements remands the

---

[2] Capt. Harris testified:

"I have seen a tarpaulin burning, catch afire on ship, where passengers have thrown cigarettes on the well deck and burned a hole right through the tarpaulin.

Q. A cigarette resting on the tarpaulin would burn a hole through it?

A. Yes, sir. I have seen that."

Dr. Snell testified:

"Q. Is there any such thing as a flameproof or waterproof tarpaulin?

A. No."

case for further proceedings on the question whether failure to cover the stow from rays of the sun could have been a cause of the fire. We submit that this is in clear violation of the well-established legal principles on which the appeal should have been decided.

That the burden of proof is on the cargo claimants to establish the cause of the fire is settled by a long line of authorities, among which are *The Cabo Hatteras*, 5 F. Supp. 725, 729; *Petition of Isbrandtsen Company*, 201 F. 2d 281, 284; and is accepted as ruling law by the claimants themselves. At the outset of their brief in the Court of Appeals, cargo counsel wrote—"The authorities establish that under these statutes cargo owners have the burden of proving that the destruction of their cargo resulted from the neglect of managing representatives of the vessel owner in the one case, and of Black Diamond in the other." (Cargo claimants' Brief on Appeal, p. 3).

The question before the Court of Appeals was not, therefore, whether this or that might have caused the fire, or whether tarpaulins if used as a cover might or might not have become impregnated. The question was, have claimants proved the cause of the fire? It was not required either of the respondents in their proofs or the trial court in his findings to show that the rays of the sun could not have caused the fire, or that tarpaulins could not have prevented the fire. It was the burden of cargo claimants to prove that the rays of the sun did in fact cause the fire, and that tarpaulins would in fact have prevented it.

The action of the Court of Appeals in this case is also in direct conflict with its own 1944 decision and opinion in *Hoskyn & Co., Inc. et. al.*, v. *Silver Line, Ltd.*, 143 F. 2d 462 (Certiorari Denied 323 U.S. 767), in which case it affirmed the dismissal of claims for cargo damage on the ground claimants had failed to prove the cause of the fire which occurred in the engine room of the vessel. The Court said at page 463:

"The libellants directed most of their energies to attempting to show that the fire was caused by the spraying of oil from a small intake pipe against the hot exhaust pipes and the hot cylinder head when excessive vibration caused the pipe to break. Yet there was no evidence that such a pipe did in fact break before the fire started. The respondent put forth a contrary theory supported by the testimony of its expert to the effect that an overhead fuel pipe in the engine room might have sprung a leak, with results later to be given. Yet there was no credible evidence that such a leak did occur so all was left to speculation."

And at page 465:

"It is no wonder that on this sort of evidence the trial judge could not decide which, if either, of these theories showed how the fire was caused or find what as a matter of fact did start it, and he had to leave that vital question unanswered. There is, therefore, nothing in this record which shows reversible error in respect to any of the decrees.

On the contrary there is ample support for the negative finding that the cause of the fire was not proved. Consequently it was not shown that any neglect of the owner caused it and such a finding is to be given effect on appeal."

That there is "ample support for the negative finding that the cause of the fire was not proved" cannot possibly be denied on the record in the case of the fire on the BLACK GULL.

In the penultimate paragraph of its opinion denying reargument in the instant case, the Court of Appeals writes as follows:

> "Libelants contended that the napthalene might have been protected by covering with tarpaulin. Petitioner's concede that the regulations say 'hazardous articles *may* be protected by the use of a tarpaulin'. The judges finding was that napthalene *could not possibly* have been protected by such means. It is with this that we have mainly found fault."

No clearer evidence of the error of the Court of Appeals in reversing the decision of the trial court could be found. Had the trial judge found that tarpaulins *could possibly* have protected the napthalene no fault would have been found with his decision. The Court of Appeals thus plainly admits that its reversal is based on its view that libellants may prevail if the evidence shows that tarpaulins *might possibly* have prevented the fire, and respondents may be liable because they failed to establish that tarpaulins *could not* have prevented the fire—a complete reversal of the established rule as to the burden of proof.

The claimants had their full day in court to make their proofs. Neither the trial court nor the Court of Appeals can say on the record that they sustained their burden of proof. What, then, is the justification for further proceedings?

The effect of the Court of Appeals decision is to hold the carrier liable unless it can prove that the fire could not possibly have resulted from its negligence. We respectfully submit that this is a reversal of established law under the Fire Statute which should be corrected by this Court.

II

The Court of Appeals erroneously holds that liability can be found against the carriers on grounds which violate the established legal rules for determining negligence.

Since the statutory fire exemptions required a dismissal of all claims where the cause of the fire was not established, the trial court properly found it unnecessary to and did not make findings as to the allegation of negligent stowage. The Court of Appeals has remanded the case for further proceedings to determine whether failure to cover the stow from the sun was negligent, and in its opinion suggests that negligence could be determined on a basis which, we submit, is contrary to well established legal principles, and which, if sustained, would create a most dangerous precedent.

As a standard of due care to determine whether it was negligent to fail to cover the stow from the sun, the Court of Appeals disregards the undisputed testimony of all twelve witnesses experienced in the carriage of naphthalene, who testified that uncovered stowage was the customary, best and safest method, and sets up as a standard its own unsupported and previously unadvanced interpretation of some wording in a United States Coast Guard regulation, and statements in letters written long after the fire in this case by unknown and unidentified persons connected with the Dutch shipping services, not called as witnesses, and their letters not even being certified or shown to be official documents.

It is unnecessary to cite in this Court at length the authorities defining negligence as failure to use the degree of care to be expected of prudent men engaged in the particular occupation. The Circuit Court of Appeals, First Circuit, said in *Roberts* v. *United Fisheries Vessels Co.*, 141 F. 2d 288 (Certiorari denied 323 U.S. 753) at page 291—

> "The nature of the business and the particular dangers involved determine the amount of care required in any particular case, whether on land or on sea. The test or standard to be adopted in determining whether the care used is proper and commensurate with the danger is the supposed conduct under the circumstances of a reasonable and prudent man. Failure to use the care that a reasonable and prudent man would use under like circumstances is the usual concept of negligence. That is the recognized standard of care required under the maritime law, under the Jones Act and under the Railroad Employees' Liability Act, 'the standards of duty' of which were 'carried over and adopted' by the Jones Act. Language used by Mr. Justice CARDOZO in his opinion in Cortes v. Baltimore Insular Line, 287 U.S. 367, 377, 53 S. Ct. 173, 176, 77 L. Ed. 368."

The court in *The Cabo Hatteras*, 5 Fed. Supp. 725 at page 735 applied the rule to stowage of cargo—

> "The question of common knowledge of a danger is to be decided from the standpoint of the knowledge, experience, and judgment of competent persons engaged at that time in loading cargo * * *."

Relying on this principle, respondents offered the testimony of twelve witnesses, five of whom were independent with no connection whatever either with the vessel owner or with Black Diamond. In addition to the four deck officers of the BLACK GULL, the Black Diamond European superintendent, the stevedore superintendent at Rotterdam and the Black Diamond Operating Manager, the following independent witnesses testified: Captain F. Verworst, nautical expert of the Tribunal of Commerce in Antwerp, who said that the stowage of the BLACK GULL was proper and in accordance with uses and customs (P.A. 187) and issued a formal certificate to that effect; Captain C. A. W. Bos,

Rotterdam Chief of the Nautical Department of the Holland-America Line who said that his company's vessels carried and still carried crude napthalene on deck uncovered as the best and safest method (P.A. 345); Captain S. Tang, General Superintendent of Terminal Operations of Isbrandtsen Steamship Co., who testified that carriage on the weather deck uncovered is the best and only safe method of stowing crude naphthalene (R.A. 84a); Captain James Harris, retired stevedore superintendent from Moore & McCormack who testified that naphthalene was always carried uncovered (R.A. 94a); Captain M. Allen, marine surveyor in New York since 1947, who gave his opinion that crude naphthalene should not under any case be covered (R.A. 106a).

The unanimous opinion of these experienced witnesses is summed up by Captain Tang at R.A. 84a:

> "Q. Why do you not recommend that it be covered with tarpaulin? A. Naphthalene being inflammable—and when we say inflammable we are not too worried about the fire hazard of the naphthalene itself, but we are extremely worried about the gases giving off from naphthalene, and in our opinion as much air as possible would prevent gas pockets from forming. In other words, we do not allow our ships to cover it with tarpaulins before lashing down—afraid of trapping gas and causing a fire hazard and the hazard of spontaneous combustion in the bags".

Not only was this the opinion of all experienced witnesses, but the evidence shows that it has been followed in long continued practice of carrying naphthalene on deck uncovered. The record shows hundreds of voyages by different steamship lines with hundreds of thousands of tons of napthalene cargoes so stowed. Month after month vessels arrived in United States ports with uncovered deck loads of crude napthalene, and no authority objected and no witness found such stowage improper or dangerous.

To oppose this evidence, the claimants called not one witness with experience in handling naphthalene cargoes. There can be only one reason—no such witness could be found. If there were a steamship man, a stevedore or surveyor who believed that stowage of naphthalene should be covered, the able counsel for claimants would certainly have produced him. It is the unanimous and undisputed testimony of all experienced witnesses that the stowage of the BLACK GULL was customary and proper.

Being unable to produce testimony, claimants' counsel dug up a Coast Guard Regulation, and on the basis of a distorted reading of a provision took the position and repeated it again and again that the stowage was a violation of United States law. The Court of Appeals now adopts this reading of a Coast Guard Regulation not as a violation of law, but as the standard of care to be applied to the question of negligence in this case.

The only charge of negligence against the carrier is failure to cover the stow of bags with tarpaulins. As the Court of Appeals states in the last paragraph of its opinion denying rehearing, this was not a violation of any regulation having the force of law. The question is whether it was a violation of the standard of due care under the law of negligence.

Although all maritime nations have regulations covering the shipment of dangerous articles, the United States Coast Guard Regulations for "Explosives and Other Dangerous Articles On Board Vessels", as amended July 1, 1947, is the only one which mentions naphthalene. These regulations cover "practically every commodity that is shipped" (P.A. 410), and naphthalene is in Class K, the least dangerous class, along with hundreds of other commodities, such as burlap, cork, cotton, paper scrap, wood shavings, etc. (Exhibit 10, P.A. 410).

The Court of Appeals in its first opinion stated (App. 19a) that by the regulations the stowage of naphthalene "is required to be under cover". The actual regulations make no such requirement, and when it was pointed out in the petition for reargument that the regulations in plain words allow shipment on deck "protected from the elements by structural erections", (i.e. bulwarks, hatch coamings, forecastle-head, housings, masthouse (R. A. 89)), the Court of Appeals then said in its opinion denying reargument that while the regulations do not require tarpaulin covers, this was one of the methods of protection allowed—"structural erections, awnings *or* tarpaulins." Thus the standard of care which the Court of Appeals sets up is no more than a permissive method of protection under the regulations.

The regulations for the carriage of cargo "on deck protected" apply to many hundreds of different commodities with differing characteristics calling for different methods of protection. Some commodities on voyages in hot climates might require protection from the sun; others such as explosives or drums of acid might require secure covering by tarpaulins. The regulations assume that the shipper will select the appropriate method, and the men responsible for stowage have always understood this. See the testimony of Captain Tang, (R.A. 88). The unanimous opinion of all experienced witnesses was that the coverage of naphthalene was improper and dangerous, and that this commodity came under the requirement of protection by structural erections.

The basis of the Court of Appeals reversal is that the sun might have been a cause of the fire, and that it might have been negligent not to cover the naphthalene from the sun on the standard of care indicated by the Coast Guard regulations. Yet the regulations themselves particularly exclude tarpaulins as a protection from the sun—"shall be protected from the elements by structural erections *or* from

the direct rays of the sun *by means of awnings or dunnaging.*"[1] Thus the standard of care indicated by the Court of Appeals is a permissive regulation which denies the use of tarpaulins as protection from the sun.[2]

The Court of Appeals also refers to a Dutch "regulation", which it said in its original opinion was "in effect" at the time of the fire; but in its opinon denying reargument the court admits the regulation was not published and therefore did not have the force of law. References to this unpublished "regulation" that naphthalene should be protected from the effects of the sun's rays are found in letters written by unidentified persons from the Dutch Shipping Inspector's office. Neither the writers nor the receivers of the letters were called to testify (Exhibits 35, 45D and W; A.A. 464a, A.A. 471a, A.A. 488a). The existence of this so-called regulation was denied by the two distinguished Dutch maritime lawyers, Drs. Van Rossem and Blusse, who after a special investigation testified that there was not and never had been any Dutch regulation mentioning naphthalene (P.A. 287; P.A. 325). It was unknown to any witness who testified—including long experienced Dutch steamship men and stevedores, and those who loaded the vessel and the officials who issued certificates approving the loading and stowage of the BLACK GULL for the voyage (Exhibit M, P.A. 424).

The Court of Appeals says that this Dutch "regulation" was "drafted by officials who presumably knew their business". What officials, and why they are presumed to know more about the stowage of cargo than the responsible men

[1] Claimants offered no evidence that the stow could have been protected by awnings or dunnaging, and the substance of the evidence is that such methods are entirely impractical for a full deck cargo on a trans-Atlantic voyage.

[2] The reasons are quite apparent from the testimony. A tarpaulin covering would trap heavy gases in the stow and increase rather than decrease heat from the sun—it would cause "a fire hazard and the hazard of spontaneous combustion in the bags" (R.A. 84a).

who actually testified does not appear. The Court then says that the Dutch "regulations" "like the Coast Guard regulations represent an accepted standard of care". Accepted by whom? Not by the experienced men employed to protect the safety of their ships and cargoes by Black Diamond, Holland-America, Isbrandtsen, Moore & McCormack, United States Lines, all of whom testified that covering the stow was improper and dangerous; not by the Tribunal of Commerce officials at Antwerp who issued a formal certificate approving the stowage of the BLACK GULL; not by any Dutch officials, none of whom had ever objected to uncovered stowage; not by the United States Coast Guard itself, since for more than thirty years ships with uncovered deck loads of naphthalene had been arriving at United States ports on hundreds of occasions without objection from any official.[1]

The opinion not only violates the established legal rules for determining negligence—if allowed to stand, it would create a most dangerous situation, with consequences to shipping which would be serious indeed. If the courts are to fix standards for methods of stowage contrary to the standard arrived at by the experience of competent seamen engaged in the business, lives and property at sea will be put in jeopardy. Suppose the stow of bags in this case had been covered by tarpaulins as suggested by the Court of Appeals. For eight days heavy gases would have accumulated in the stow, and when fire broke out there could have been immediate and total disaster, rather than a four and one-hour period to fight the fire and bring off the passengers and most of the crew to safety.

---

[1] Claimants had Commander Mazzotta, the officer charged with the enforcement of Coast Guard regulations on the stand, but carefully refrained from asking him if uncovered stowage of naphthalene on deck violated the regulations (A. A. 387a).

CONCLUSION

The opinion and decision of the Court of Appeals in this case does violence both to settled law under the Fire Statute and established rules of the law of negligence. If allowed to stand it will have far-reaching and most damaging effects on United States and, indeed, world-wide shipping interests. We respectfully submit that this situation calls for correction in this Court.

February 28, 1958.

WARNER PYNE,
DUDLEY C. SMITH,
Counsel for Petitioner.

[Appendix Follows]

District Court Opinion

(Filed July 23, 1956; reported 144 Fed. Sup. 1956)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

DIMOCK, *D. J.*

This controversy arises out of a fire which occurred on the Norwegian M/V Black Gull, on July 18, 1952. As a result of this fire, the vessel became a constructive total loss and most of her cargo was either destroyed or damaged. Four members of the crew lost their lives. Other members of the crew and some of the passengers allege that they were injured and that they lost their baggage and personal effects.

Four proceedings have been instituted as a result of this disaster. The first is a proceeding for exoneration from or limitation of liability instituted by Skibs A/S Jolund, owner of the Black Gull. The second and third cases are suits for non-delivery of and damage to the cargo which was on board the Black Gull at the time of the fire. Libelants, in those two suits, are the owners or underwriters of that cargo. Respondent in those suits, Black Diamond Steampship Corp., was the time charterer of the Black Gull and issued the bills of lading for the cargo carried on that voyage. The fourth proceeding is one for wrongful death of a Belgian mess-boy, brought by his widow and children against the same respondent. I have not attempted to distinguish between libelants and claimants and for purposes of this memorandum, I have grouped both under the term "libellants" except where otherwise indicated.

There is no real dispute about the facts leading up to the disaster. The vessel left Rotterdam on July 10, 1952,

bound for United States east coast ports, the first of which was to be New York. She carried general cargo below decks which had been loaded at Bremen, Hamburg, Antwerp and Rotterdam. In addition, she carried on the weather deck approximately five hundred fifty tons of crude naphthalene in previously used jute or burlap bags which had been loaded in Antwerp and Rotterdam. The vessel on this voyage was manned by a crew of forty and carried nine passengers.

The crude naphthalene was stowed about six bags high. The stow covered both port and starboard sides of the afterdeck over an area of some 13-16 feet wide and approximately 90 feet long. The forward weather deck of the vessel, both port and starboard, contained an approximately similar stow of bagged crude naphthalene. In athwartship direction, the stow started just inboard of the bulkwarks and continued to a line about three feet out from the sides of the hatch coamings. A dunnage fence kept the stow clear of the bulkwarks and permitted a three foot wide passageway through which members of the crew could pass. This passageway also kept sounding plugs and hose connections available to the crew. The stow was secured in place by rope nets but was otherwise uncovered.

On the evening of July 18, 1952, the vessel passed the Nantucket Shoals Light on her way to New York. At about eleven o'clock, the deck officer, standing in the starboard wing of the bridge, heard what he described as "a hollow dull dump" from the afterpart of the vessel. Looking in that direction, he saw smoke and a small flame coming from the after weather deck port side abreast number 4 hatch about 100 feet from his position on the bridge. After ordering water on deck, he went to the area in the vicinity of the smoke. He there saw fire in the middle of the top of the load and fire on the side of the load between the second and third tiers from the top.

Although an attempt was made to extinguish the fire it was necessary to abandon the vessel about four and a half hours after the fire was discovered.

During the voyage, the temperatures ranged from a high of 77°F to a low of 61°F. The last recording taken on the 4-8 P. M. watch on July 18th indicated a temperature of 72°F. These temperatures were taken on the bridge and therefore indicated the temperature in the shade only.

Passenger claimants stated in their brief that the fire was caused in one of two ways. They state that it was caused either by external ignition from something like a cigarette butt or spark or that it was caused by spontaneous combustion in the stow of naphthalene. They further allege that negligence of the petitioner or respondent was responsible for the disaster, whether the physical cause of the fire was external ignition or spontaneous combustion.

In order to recover, libelants must prove that the fire was caused through design or neglect of the petitioner or respondent. *Automobile Insurance Co.* v. *United Fruit Co.*, 2 Cir., 224 F. 2d 72.

Here, there are two possible causes of the fire. Passenger claimants expressly conceded this point in their brief filed subsequent to trial. While the libelants have attempted to rule out spontaneous combustion as a cause of the fire, the evidence clearly shows it to be chemically possible. There was testimony of a "hollow dull dump" immediately before the fire was discovered. Dr. Purdy, respondent's expert, testified that a fire caused by ignition from a spark or cigarette butt on the top of the stow would probably not commence with such a sound. Since the bags were packed so closely together that no crevices remained between them, it is doubtful that an outside ignition source could have found its way below the top of the stow. In addition, the location of the start of the fire lends credibility to the possibility of spontaneous com-

bustion. The first close investigation found the fire in the middle of the top of the stow and on the side of the stow between the second and third tiers from the top. Under cross-examination by the libelants, Dr. Purdy testified that a fire which started on the top of the stow would not naturally work directly downward; rather, he stated, it would be expected to flame over the surface and through the flow of melting naphthalene to distribute the fire. On the other hand, a fire which started within the stow would naturally work out to the side at that level and work up to the top directly above it. This is exactly the position of the fire when first investigated. Thus, since a fire resulting from spontaneous combustion would start within the stow, this lends further strength to that possibility in this disaster.

Dr. Purdy, the expert called by respondent, testified as to the possibility of spontaneous combustion of the bagging having caused this fire. He stated that self-heating may cause a fire in previously used bags in which impurities from prior commodities might remain. In two tests he ran involving similar bagging, some self-heating resulted. From these experiments he stated that, without definitely knowing that no impurities were present in the bags on the Black Gull, spontaneous combustion was chemically possible. Both Dr. Purdy and Dr. Snell, the experts called by libelants, agreed that, once the bagging started to burn, the heat from the burning bagging would ignite the naphthalene.

There being no direct testimony as to an external ignition, spontaneous combustion of the bagging cannot be eliminated as a possible cause of the fire.

Libelants must prove that petitioner or respondent was negligent and that negligence was the cause of the fire whether it was started by external ignition or by spontaneous combustion. Without this proof, the fire might have been caused without any negligence on the part of petitioner. In that event, libelants would be barred from

recovery. *Automobile Insurance Co. v. United Fruit Co.*, 2 Cir., 224 F. 2d 72, *supra*.

There are, therefore, two questions that are immediately before me. They are: (1) If the fire was caused by spontaneous combustion, did any negligence of petitioner or respondent cause the spontaneous combustion? (2) If the fire was caused by external ignition, did the failure to cover the stow of naphthalene with a tarpaulin proximately cause the first? I will discuss these questions separately.

1. Libelants contend that, if spontaneous combustion occurred, it could only have done so because of foreign impurities in the bags. Otherwise a rising temperature in the crude naphthalene itself would have caused the naphthalene to melt and consequently cool before it reached its flash point.

Libelants then contend that petitioner or respondent was negligent in allowing the use of bags soiled with impurities and in not providing sufficient ventilation so that spontaneous combustion would be prevented.

So far as evidence is concerned libelants left this issue severely alone. There is no evidence that the impurities on the material of the bags which would render naphthalene susceptible to spontaneous combustion would be discoverable on inspection. Libelants do not go to the extent of saying that the danger inherent in stowing naphthalene in second hand bags was so notorious that the petitioner or respondent should have refused to accept the cargo. They suggest that loose stowage permitting ventilation would inhibit spontaneous combustion but no evidence was offered that there was any feasible method of stowage which would have that effect. No explanation was vouchsafed as to how those responsible for the ship could permit the ventilation alleged to be necessary to inhibit spontaneous combustion and, at one and the same

time, envelope the cargo with the tarpaulins alleged to be necessary to protect it from sparks and cigarette butts. I find that libelants have failed to sustain the burden of proof that the petitioner or respondent was negligent in accepting cargo in a condition susceptible to spontaneous combustion or in failing to stow it so as to inhibit spontaneous combustion.

2. In discussing this possibility of outside ignition, I shall assume, without deciding the question, that the failure to cover the stow with a tarpaulin was either negligent or in violation of a controlling statute or regulation. I therefore turn to the question whether this failure to cover the stow with a tarpaulin proximately caused the fire.

Libelants' argument that a tarpaulin would have prevented ignition from an external source runs something like this. The danger of ignition of crude naphthalene is increased by heating. As the temperature rises, greater amounts of readily-ignitable gases are given off. Since the temperature in the area of the stow was in excess of 120° F., the naphthalene was giving off a substantial quantity of gases which impregnated the bagging and made the bagging susceptible to ignition from a spark or cigarette butt. In addition, the bagging was impregnated with creosote oil from the crude naphthalene which is also readily ignitable. From these allegations libelants argue that a tarpaulin would have protected the stow from heating by the direct rays of the sun and would have prevented contact between a spark or cigarette butt and the bagging impregnated with creosote oil and gases.

I cannot accept libelants' contention. First of all, the testimony is overwhelming that the sun's rays could not have caused or contributed to the cause of the fire. Both Dr. Purdy, respondent's expert, and Mr. Aeby whom libelants assert to be "the leading European authority on

dangerous cargo", unequivocally state this conclusion. Therefore, the presence of a tarpaulin, by protecting the stow from the sun's rays, would not have prevented this fire.

Nor would a tarpaulin have afforded protection from ignition due to creosote oil or gases. A tarpaulin could have done so only if the creosote oil and gases could not impregnate the tarpaulin or if the tarpaulin was itself not inflammable. Neither is the fact. Libelants' Exhibit 38, an order issued by respondent that naphthalene must not be stored on hatches contains the sentence "This material permeates tarpaulins and hatch boards and in a recent instance damaged cargo and necessitated replacement of ceiling". Thus the creosote oil and gases could impregnate the tarpaulin and thereby make the tarpaulin as inflammable as the impregnated bagging. There is no claim that tarpaulins are not inflammable. In fact, Captain Harris, an employee of Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., testified in both direct and cross-examination to having seen tarpaulins burn. Thus the failure to cover the stow with a tarpaulin could not have been a contributing cause of the fire.

The effect of the above discussion is that I hold that there is no proof that the fire was caused by the negligence of either petitioner or respondent.

In deciding that petitioner and respondent have not been proved to be guilty of negligence I recognize that they are required to exercise a higher degree of care for the safety of passengers than for the safety of cargo. *Maibrunn* v. *Hamburg-American S. S. Co.*, 2 Cir., 77 F. 2d 304; *Moore* v. *American Scantic Line*, 2 Cir., 121 F. 2d 767. Nevertheless I find that libelants have not sustained the burden of proof that any failure of petitioner or respondent to exercise the high degree of care of which a carrier must devote to the safety of passengers was the proximate cause of any loss or damage.

There still remains for my decision the questions whether respondent was negligent in its attempt to extinguish the fire and whether respondent was negligent in its rescue operation.

No serious claim is made that respondent did not do everything within its power to extinguish the fire. Water was applied to the fire immediately after it was discovered and at a time when the fire was still restricted to a small area. There is no evidence which could lead me to believe that respondent's failure to extinguish the fire, after four and a half hours of fighting it, was due to any fault on its part. From the evidence, I believe that the officers and crew of the Black Gull did the best possible job against an unbeatable fire.

Passenger libelants allege that the passengers were further injured due to negligent use of the lifeboats. They contend that as soon as the severity of the fire was discovered the port lifeboat should have been lowered in order to prevent its destruction. In addition, they claim that the starboard lifeboat, after they were in it, was kept moored to the Black Gull and that this resulted in scorching which in turn forced them into the water.

The reason that the master gave for not lowering the port lifeboat was that it would have required sending men into an area close to the fire. This, he felt, would have unnecessarily placed those men in a potentially dangerous situation. In addition, the starboard lifeboat had sufficient room for all members of the crew and passengers. There was, therefore, no absolute necessity for saving the port lifeboat. Once the port lifeboat was destroyed, however, it was necessary to keep the starboard lifeboat close to the vessel to take on the members of the crew if total abandonment of the vessel was ordered. Thus it was necessary to keep the lowered starboard lifeboat close to the burning vessel.

As a matter of fact it was not proved that keeping the lifeboat moored to the vessel resulted in the scorching and submersion. The starboard lifeboat, with the passengers in it, was let down from its davits on the midships building. It was then hauled forward in order to have it forward of the fire. The wind and sea were coming from the starboard side and the boat was shipping water. At the same time water from the fire hoses was running through the scuppers on deck down into the boat. The second officer, who was in the boat, cut the painter which moored the boat to the vessel and the members of the crew in the boat tried to get the boat clear of the ship's side. The ship had headway, however, and they were unable to get the boat far enough from it before the boat got abreast of the fire at number 4 hatch to avoid the scorching of the heat. The second officer therefore ordered all to go overboard on the lee side of the boat and hang onto the lifeline. After the boat passed number 4 hatch they all got into the lifeboat again. With only four oars in use and without rowing the lifeboat was kept near the ship. Four members of the crew thereafter jumped overboard from the ship and were picked up. Then all the rest of the crew, except the four who lost their lives, came aboard from the vessel. All in the boat were rescued by the Gripsholm.

I need not determine from my hindsight knowledge whether I would have followed a different plan in abandoning the vessel. I cannot say that the master's choice in not saving the port lifeboat was negligence. At that time, it was foreseeable that the fire would be extinguished. Therefore he saw no need to send men into the fire area to lower the port lifeboat. Once that lifeboat was destroyed, the master had no alternative but to keep the starboard lifeboat available to rescue all persons on board the vessel. Since the boat had to be kept available it was natural to keep it moored until it appeared that the sea against the

side of the vessel and the water from the scuppers were filling it. There is no suggestion that the cutting of the painter was negligent or that the failure to get far enough from the ship to avoid scorching as the boat passed number 4 hatch was negligent. Since passenger libelants' criticism is that the boat was kept moored, their position must be that it was negilgent to moor the boat to the ship until it appeared that the boat was in danger of filling instead of trying to get clear of the ship as soon as the boat was in the water. There is, however, no reason to believe that, if they had tried to get clear of the ship immediately they would have been any more successful in getting away from the effective range of the fire. No attempt was made to show that the fire was any hotter when the boat finally passed it than when the boat was first launched.

There is therefore no negligence proved in the fighting of the fire or in the rescue operations.

I therefore grant the petition for exoneration from liability and deny libelants any recovery.

E. J. DIMOCK
United States District Judge

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

For the Second Circuit

(Decided November 29, 1957).

POPE, *Circuit Judge*:

The proceedings in the court below grew out of a fire which occurred on the Norwegian M/S Black Gull on July 18, 1952, while she was on a voyage from North European ports to New York. Four members of the crew lost their lives; most of the cargo was either destroyed or damaged, and the vessel became a constructive total loss. These proceedings were three in number: the first was one for exoneration from or limitation of liability instituted by Skibs A/S Jolund, owner of the Black Gull; the second was a suit for non-delivery of and damage to the cargo which was on board at the time of the fire (the libelants in that suit are the owners or underwriters of the cargo, and the respondent was Black Diamond Steamship Co., time charterer of the Black Gull, on its own behalf and on behalf of the Master); and the third proceeding was one to recover for the wrongful death of one of the lost seamen brought by his widow and children against the Black Diamond Steamship Corp.

The facts leading up to the fire and the loss are set forth in the second amended memorandum of the trial judge, as follows: "The vessel left Rotterdam on July 10, 1952, bound for United States east coast ports, the first of which was to be New York. She carried general cargo below decks which had been loaded at Bremen, Hamburg, Antwerp and Rotterdam. In addition, she carried on the weather deck approximately five hundred fifty tons of crude naphthalene in previously used jute or burlap bags which had been loaded in Antwerp and Rotterdam. The vessel

on this voyage was manned by a crew of forty and carried nine passengers.

"The crude naphthalene was stowed about six bags high. The stow covered both port and starboard sides of the afterdeck over an area of some 13-16 feet wide and approximately 90 feet long. The forward weather deck of the vessel, both port and starboard, contained an approximately similar stow of bagged crude naphthalene. In athwartship direction, the stow started just inboard of the bulwarks and continued to a line about three feet out from the sides of the hatch coamings. A dunnage fence kept the stow clear of the bulwarks and permitted a three foot wide passageway through which members of the crew could pass. This passageway also kept sounding plugs and hose connections available to the crew. The stow was secured in place by rope nets but was otherwise uncovered.

"On the evening of July 18, 1952, the vessel passed the Nantucket Shoals Light on her way to New York. At about eleven o'clock, the deck officer, standing on the starboard wing of the bridge, heard what he described as 'a hollow dull dump' from the afterpart of the vessel. Looking in that direction, he saw smoke and a small flame coming from the after weather deck port side abreast number 4 hatch about 100 feet from his position on the bridge. After ordering water on deck, he went to the area in the vicinity of the smoke. He there saw fire in the middle of the top of the load and fire on the side of the load between the second and third tiers from the top.

"Although an attempt was made to extinguish the fire it was necessary to abandon the vessel about four and a half hours after the fire was discovered."

The libel of the cargo owners against Black Diamond Steamship Corp. (here called Black Diamond), after referring to the shipments, and bills of lading therefor, al-

leged: "The shipments described on Schedule 'B' either have not been delivered at all to the persons entitled thereto or have been delivered to them short, slack and seriously injured and damaged, and such parts of said shipments as have been delivered were, at time of delivery, subject to alleged liens for salvage and other charges not contracted for in the said bills of lading."

Black Diamond asserted non-liability under the *Carriage of Goods by Sea Act* (U. S. C. Title 46, §1304(2)), which provides that the carrier shall not be responsible for loss or damage from fire "unless caused by the actual fault or privity of the carrier." These cargo owners, appellants here, claim there was fault or negligence on the part of Black Diamond's managing agents, in failing to protect or cover the deck stow of bagged naphthalene from the direct rays of the sun so as to avoid heating and to protect from the foreseeable possibility of ignition from sources such as sparks, lighted cigarettes or cigar butts.

The court made no finding as to whether Black Diamond was guilty of negligence in these respects for it held that any failure to cover the bags of naphthalene could not have been a contributing cause of the fire; that coverage of the stow would not have prevented the fire. In its Finding 36, that there was lack of proof that any such failure to cover the stow was a proximate cause of the fire, the court said: "Even if it be assumed that failure to cover the stow of bagged naphthalene with a tarpaulin was either negligence or in violation of controlling statute or regulation, libelants have not proved that that failure was a proximate cause of the fire." Its key findings as to lack of causation are its Nos. 29 and 35, as follows: "29. The sun's rays could not have caused or contributed to the cause of the fire." "35. The failure to cover the bags of naphthalene on the 'Black Gull' with a tarpaulin was not and could not have been a contributing cause of the fire." Findings 30 to 34 inclusive were evidently intended to

be explanatory of one reason for the court's finding of lack of proof of causation,[1] stated in the court's second amended memorandum as follows: "2. In discussing this possibility of outside ignition, I shall assume, without deciding the question, that the failure to cover the stow with a tarpaulin was either negligent or in violation of a controlling statute or regulation. I therefore turn to the question whether this failure to cover the stow with a tarpaulin proximately caused the fire.

"Libelant's argument that a tarpaulin would have prevented ignition from an external source runs something like this. The danger of ignition of crude naphthalene is increased by heating. As the temperature rises, greater amounts of readily-ignitable gases are given off. Since the temperature in the area of the stow was in excess of 120° F., the naphthalene was giving off a substantial quantity of gases which impregnated the bagging and made the bagging susceptible to ignition from a spark or cigarette butt. In addition, the bagging was impregnated with creosote oil from the crude naphthalene which is also readily ignitable. From these allegations libelants argue that a

---

[1]These are as follows: "30. Tarpaulins are inflammable.

"31. Coverage of the stow of bagged naphthalene with a tarpaulin would not have prevented the fire on the 'Black Gull.'

"32. A tarpaulin coverage would not have afforded protection from ignition due to creosote oil or gases. A tarpaulin could have afforded protection only if the creosote oil or gases could not impregnate the tarpaulin or if the tarpaulin itself was not inflammable. Neither is the fact.

"33. The gases given off by crude naphthalene would permeate or saturate tarpaulins which covered bagged naphthalene.

"34. Creosote oil from the crude naphthalene and the gases given off by the crude naphthalene could have impregnated a tarpaulin covering bagged crude naphthalene and would thereby make the tarpaulin as inflammable as the impregnated bagging."

tarpaulin would have protected the stow from heating by the direct rays of the sun and would have prevented contact between a spark or cigarette butt and the bagging impregnated with creosote oil and gases.

"I cannot accept libelants' contention. First of all, the testimony is overwhelming that the sun's rays could not have caused or contributed to the cause of the fire. Both Dr. Purdy, respondent's expert, and Mr. Aeby whom libelants assert to be 'the leading European authority on dangerous cargo,' unequivocally state this conclusion. Therefore, the presence of a tarpaulin, by protecting the stow from the sun's rays, would not have prevented this fire.

"Nor would a tarpaulin have afforded protection from ignition due to creosote oil or gases. A tarpaulin could have done so only if the creosote oil and gases could not impregnate the tarpaulin or if the tarpaulin was itself not inflammable. Neither is the fact Libelants' Exhibit 38, an order issued by respondent that naphthalene must not be stored on hatches contains the sentence 'This material permeates tarpaulins and hatch boards and in a recent instance damaged cargo and necessitated replacement of ceiling.' Thus the creosote oil and gases could impregnate the tarpaulin and thereby make the tarpaulin as inflammable as the impregnated bagging."

If we assume, as did the trial judge, that the failure to cover the stow was negligence, it is our opinion that the quoted findings to the effect that the failure to cover the naphthalene could not have been a contributing cause of the fire, were clearly erroneous. Noting the court's reference, in the portion of the opinion last quoted, to the testimony of Dr. Purdy and Dr. Aeby, it seems probable that the trial judge misinterpreted what they said. In the quoted portion of the opinion the court found that the temperature in the area of the stow was in excess of 120° F. Dr. Aeby, testifying on deposition as an expert witness for the cargo owners, stated that even at 70° to 75° F.

particles of naphthalene gas would be liberated into the air, and (as the court found), that "as the temperature rises naphthalene gives off increasing amounts of gas", and that those gas particles which are given off will ignite at a temperature of approximately 125 F. which is the "flash" point of pure naphthalene.[2]

It is true that in answer to a hypothetical question reciting the temperatures recorded in the log book on the vessel during the period of July 11 through July 18 (the day on which the fire broke out), Dr. Aeby testified that, based on an assumption of certain named maximum temperatures, it would be his opinion that the rays of the sun could not have been a cause or contributing cause of the fire. But these named temperatures were immaterial. Apparently the Judge overlooked the fact that these temperatures stated in the hypothetical question were taken inside the chart room on the bridge and in the shade. The highest temperature taken there was 25 centigrade or 77 F. recorded at noon on July 18 (the day of the fire). That was not the important temperature;—the important one was the temperature in the area of the stow found to be in excess of 120 F. at which time, the court's opinion says, "the naphthalene was giving off a substantial quantity of gases which impregnated the bagging and made the bagging susceptible to ignition from a spark or cigarette butt."

Both Dr. Aeby and Dr. Purdy (who was Black Diamond's expert), testified that the temperature on the deck which was exposed to the sun would be much higher than that on the bridge in the shade. Dr. Purdy also testified that the quantity of gas given off would be increasingly greater as the temperature rose; and that in his opinion there was no possibility that the sun's rays would raise the temperature

[2]Dr. Snell, an expert testifying for Libellants, stated that the flash point of crude naphthalene was "somewhat lower" than that of pure naphthalene. Dr. Aeby said he could not tell the precise flash point of this crude naphthalene without testing the particular product.

to the point where the gas would ignite. But it is noted that it is not the theory of the appellants that the gas would ignite because of the heat alone. Dr. Purdy's testimony seems to mean that the temperature where the cargo was stored was never high enough to cause it to burst into flame unaided by an ignited flame. This does not sustain a conclusion that the sun's rays could not have "contributed to the cause of the fire."

The record shows that the rays of the sun increased the heat of the deck cargo and as the heat increased the amount of gas released became greater and greater. The recorded bridge temperatures indicated that the hottest day was the day the fire broke out; as shown in the court's opinion, the temperature at this point exceeded 120° F. The gas would, according to the testimony of Capt. Hollaar, Black Diamond's marine superintendent, mix with the air and form an explosive mixture. Plainly enough such gas was a dangerous substance, and in view of the likelihood of ignition by sparks, burning cigarettes or cigars, the production of excess quantities of the gas could well be the proximate cause of the fire.

Another respect in which it would appear that the trial court was led mistakenly to conclude that failure to cover the bags of naphthalene could not have been a contributing cause of the fire was in its failure to note the substantial evidence in the record that a tarpaulin coverage would have afforded protection from ignition. The trial court's views with respect to the efficacy of a tarpaulin are expressed in its findings, Nos. 30-34 inclusive, set forth in footnote 1, *supra*. They are also expressed in the last paragraph of the portion of the opinion which we have quoted above. The Judge's theory, there disclosed, is that if the stow had been covered by a tarpaulin, the gases and the creosote oil given off by the crude naphthalene would have impregnated the tarpaulin or saturated it and made it as inflammable as the impregnated bagging. There is no such evidence in the record.

Evidently the trial judge thought that libelant's exhibit 38 tended to support his view that the gases and oil would permeate a tarpaulin used to cover the bagged naphthalene; but exhibit 38 has no reference to a tarpaulin so used. It is a directive addressed by Black Diamond to all masters and mates and dated March 30, 1933. Assuming that the fact that the libelant introduced this exhibit takes away from its self-serving character, it refers not to tarpaulins used to cover a stow of naphthalene but it is a directive against stowing naphthalene on hatches.[3] If naphthalene were piled on a hatch or hatch cover which in turn was covered by a tarpaulin, the likelihood of the creosote oil under the pressure of the pile permeating the tarpaulin could readily be conceded without its having any bearing whatever on what would happen to a tarpaulin which was used to cover a stow of bagged naphthalene. The law of gravity makes the difference.

With respect to tarpaulins used for covers, there was evidence to the effect that they would serve the purpose of aiding in preventing fire. Dr. Snell, an expert called by libelants, testified that tar had not been used in water proofing of tarpaulins for generations; that in modern times the cloth of a tarpaulin is treated with chlorinated paraffine which serves the purpose of both waterproofing and flameproofing. Capt. Hollaar testified that tarpaulins used on Black Diamond's ships were impregnated with material to make them watertight. There is no evidence in the record that gas would permeate a watertight tarpaulin. Capt. Hollaar testified further that if the outside source of ignition were a cigar or cigarette butt, it would be much less likely to ignite the stow if it were covered by tarpaulin

---

[3]The communication stated in exhibit 38 read as follows: "TO ALL MASTERS & MATES: *'NAPHTHALENE'* Under no circumstances is naphthalene to be stowed on hatches. This material permeates tarpaulins and hatch boards and in a recent instance damaged cargo and necessitated replacement of ceiling. This commodity therefore is to be stowed on steel decks only."

than if the stow were uncovered. Perhaps the most persuasive proof that the trial court must have been mistaken in its belief that covering the stow with a tarpaulin would be wholly ineffective to prevent fire, is furnished by the regulations of the United States Coast Guard. Under those regulations naphthalene, crude or refined, is classified as a hazardous article, and its stowage is required to be under cover.[4]

Regulation 146.27-6 provides as follows: "Protection for 'on deck' stowage.—Hazardous articles that are permitted stowage 'on deck in open' or 'on deck protected' may be protected by the use of structural erections, awnings, or tarpaulins."

Regulation 146.03-34 recites that under the regulations stowage terms are defined as follows: "(b) On deck protected means the articles may be stowed on the open weather deck of a vessel. It is required that dangerous cargo stowed under such conditions shall be protected from the elements by structural erections or from the direct rays of the sun by means of awnings or dunnaging."

It seems to us significant that in the Coast Guard regulations tarpaulins are an approved method of protection for hazardous articles with no suggestion whatever that they are not suitable for protection of bagged naphthalene.[5]

---

[4] These regulations provide under the heading of "Required Conditions for Transportation" with respect to naphthalene and on a cargo vessel as follows: "Stowage: 'On deck protected.' 'On deck under cover.' 'Tween decks readily accessible.' 'Under deck (in a cool, dry, well ventilated hold).'"

[5] In its findings the court ignores the regulations' reference to "structural erections" and "awnings." Some witnesses for the owner and for Black Diamond testified that in their view those would be impractical because they would be carried away in storms. One who testified that awnings were impractical was a Capt. Tang, an employee of another steamship company. This is the same witness who essayed an interpretation of the Coast Guard regulations by stating that it was his view that the words "on deck protected" meant "pro-

We hold therefore that this case cannot be disposed of on the basis of the court's erroneous finding that there was no proof of proximate causation. This means that the trial court should have made findings upon the question of whether there was negligence on the part of Black Diamond in the respect claimed by the appellants, namely, the failure to cover the cargo to protect it from the sun and from outside ignition.

Of course to charge Black Diamond with negligence sufficient to establish liability, it must appear that the negligence was with "the actual fault or privity of the carrier." If the failure to cover the cargo here was negligence, it was plainly "that of an executive officer, manager or superintendent whose scope of authority includes supervision over the phase of the business out of which the loss or injury occurred."[6]

Capt. Hollaar, who did not hesitate to assume full responsibility for the way in which the bagged naphthalene was stowed, was a supervisory and executive official in this sense. He had general supervision over all matters relating to the loading of ships for Black Diamond in the ports of Hamburg, Bremen, Rotterdam and Antwerp. He was the company's European marine superintendent. As the

---

tected against the sea, to be lost overboard, the bags torn open, or the cargo scattered." He said that this protection was afforded by the "forecastle head, bulwark and hatch coamings." The Captain's interpretation of the Coast Guard regulations was plainly in direct conflict with the express language of the regulations quoted above. Capt. Hollaar had no such understanding as had Capt. Tang, for he testified as follows: "Q. And you knew that under the Coast Guard regulations of the United States if carried on deck it must be under a cover or protected by awnings or tarpaulins? A. I knew that the Coast Guard regulations read that way. Q. You knew that the naphthalene on 'Black Gull' was not so covered? A. Yes.

[6]The quoted language is from *Coryell* v. *Phipps*, 317 U. S. 406, 410. The court was there discussing the meaning of the phrase; "privity or knowledge" in connection with a limitation of liability proceeding. The same test is applicable here.

court found, he was "in complete charge of all matters of stowage on vessels under charter to respondent and had no superior in Europe." There is no contention that Capt. Hollaar was not Black Diamond's alter ego in Europe, or that he was not performing with authority duties of a managerial nature. Cf. *The Edmund Fanning,* S. D. N. Y., 105 F. Supp. 353, 364, 369, affirmed on this point, 201 F. 2d 281, 284.

Capt. Hollaar participated in the preparation of the loading plan for the Black Gull before her departure; he knew that she was to carry naphthalene which was to be loaded on deck; he saw it when loaded, and saw that it was not covered. He knew that the naphthalene was volatile: that gas would escape and that when mixed with air it could form an explosive mixture; that naphthalene was classified as hazardous cargo; and he had read many handbooks on dangerous cargoes including that of Dr. Aeby. This book, a standard authority on the topic, described and classified various types of dangerous goods, that is, those defined in the book as "those which of themselves or by reason of chance circumstances may give rise to difficulties or cause accidents during transport by boat." The book stated that "By inflammable, * * * we understand a substance which at a more or less high temperature, gives off such gases as, in the presence of a naked flame, ignite or explode. The temperature at which this phenomenon occurs is called 'flashing point' or 'flash point' and is determined by the Abel-Pensky apparatus." The author then lists the flash points of some 38 chemical compounds in which appears "naphthalene—125° F." The book contains recommendations for packing and stowage of various kinds of goods and under the head of naphthalene the recommended stowage is stated as follows: "Stowage: On deck, covered and protected from the rays of the sun or under deck, in a cool and well-ventilated compartment, away from living quarters and foodstuffs." Capt. Hollaar also acknowledged familiarity with the regulations of the U. S. Coast Guard

relating to dangerous articles on board vessels to which we have previously referred.

There was also evidence of a Dutch shipping decree in effect when this vessel left Rotterdam which contained a regulation relating to the stowage of naphthalene on board ship reciting that such stowage should be "On deck protected from the sun's rays; or below deck in a well-ventilated, dry hold, in a cool place." We note also that the same Dutch regulation provided: "Open fires and smoking near a cargo of naphthalene must be prohibited."

This reference to smoking suggests that which requires no specific evidence, namely, that in the circumstances of this case, the likelihood of ignition of the gas by a spark from the stack or burning cigarettes or cigar butts was foreseeable.[7] The foreseeability of such an occurrence is evidenced not only by the fact of the making of the quoted provision concerning smoking in the Dutch regulations, but it is a matter of common knowledge that where smoking goes on the smokers are likely to throw away burning cigarettes or cigars. One cannot drive through a national or state forest without being reminded by road signs of this common fact of life. The court found that certain of the passengers smoked on the voyage, as did certain of the officers and crew. It found that the passengers smoked on the weather deck, the boat deck, the sun deck and the bridge deck.[8] Some of the passengers smoked on the boat

---

[7]Dr. Snell stated that the bagged naphthalene itself might be ignited directly from a cigarette. His theory was that since a burning cigarette produces a temperature of at least 500° F., and naphthalene melts at 174° F., if a cigarette fell on a bag the naphthalene would melt and be absorbed by the bagging material, which would act like a wick in a candle, thus igniting the whole contents of the bag.

[8]There were five or six "No Smoking" signs, some of which were visible from the boat deck, and in the cabins were signs warning against throwing cigars or cigarettes out of port holes, or over the side.

deck after dinner on the evening on which the fire started. Some of the crew smoked on the main deck. It was also found that there were no receptacles on any of the decks for burnt cigars, cigarettes or matches. The uncovered stow of the naphthalene aft the court found extended to within approximately 6 feet of the boat deck.

Without making any finding as to whether the fire occurred through spontaneous combustion the court referred to it by finding that "there is a theoretical possibility of spontaneous ignition of the bags containing the naphthalene," and that "spontaneous combustion of the bagging cannot be eliminated as a possible cause of the fire." The court further found that pure naphthalene is not susceptible to spontaneous ignition, but that none of the bags in which it was packed had been tested for susceptibility to spontaneous ignition.

Appellants argue that the fire could not have resulted from spontaneous combustion. But even if there had been evidence of a possible spontaneous combustion, clearly enough the dangerous substance was the gas produced by the heat. Increased heat would increase the volume of gas and failure to protect the stow from the direct rays of the sun could well constitute a contributing cause of a fire from spontaneous combustion. Assuming that spontaneous combustion was possible, it would be foreseeable that a likelihood of that taking place would be increased as the heat and the gas increased. In other words, the danger was foreseeable whether it came about through sparks, cigarettes or spontaneous combustion.

The cause must therefore be remanded for further findings on two issues:

(1) Was it negligent to fail to cover the cargo from the sun?

(2) If so, was the negligence the cause of the damage?

In passing upon the question of negligence, it is not important that the vessel had not entered United States waters when the fire occurred so that Coast Guard regulations had not then become operative as a controlling or binding statute. The court can consider these and the Dutch regulations as a norm or standard of care. With these the court may consider such facts of common knowledge as the tendency of smokers to throw away lighted butts; the fact that the wind blowing across the boat deck on the day the fire occurred would tend to carry a tossed cigarette in the direction of the bagged naphthalene; that the direct rays of the sun cause heat, and in a confined area out of the wind, the heat tends to increase further. The court may consider the feasibility of precautions, such as covering with tarpaulin, or the furnishing of what the Coast Guard regulations describe as "structural erections," or "awnings." We cannot say that there are no other feasible methods for protecting cargo from the sun. Some of Black Diamond's witnesses objected to tarpaulin covers as likely to hold and trap the gas from the naphthalene. We cannot say as a matter of law on this record that a tarpaulin over the top, but not over the sides of the cargo would not be feasible. This gas is heavier than air. Some of the same witnesses testified that many cargo carriers stowed naphthalene in the same manner here employed.[9] Proof of trade practice is not proof of what constitutes due care in the premises, nor is the utilization of reasonably required safety devices excused merely because they involve additional expense.

On the question of causation the court may find that the increased amount of gas generated by the sun's heat was

---

[9]Although Capt. Hollaar testified that Black Diamond's practice was to carry crude naphthalene on deck uncovered, he recalled instances in which such cargo had been covered on the insistence of the shippers. It also appeared that competition had compelled Black Diamond to accept shipments of naphthalene for "under deck" stowage.

confined to the top layer of burlap bags and was rapidly dissipated by the wind, so that it was not a cause of disaster, or it may find that the sun heated the bags despite the breeze. Failure to negative completely the possibility of spontaneous combustion does not prevent recovery here if it is shown that the catastrophe was in fact caused by negligent failure to protect the cargo from the sun. Whether the spark that triggered the fire was spontaneous or from a cigarette, the liability of the persons responsible for failing to keep the sun off is the same.

The Verbeeck Case Against Black Diamond

Verbeecks' libel bases its claim for recovery against Black Diamond for the death of this Belgian seaman on the provisions of the Death on the High Seas Act, Title 46, §§ 761-768, which provides a cause of action for death "caused by wrongful act, neglect, or default occurring on the high seas."[10] It was stipulated that under the law of Norway a similar right of action for death by wrongful act is granted the widow, children and other dependents of a Belgian seaman employed on a Norwegian ship.

---

[10] "§ 761. Right of action; where and by whom brought—Whenever the death of a person shall be caused by wrongful act, neglect, or default occurring on the high seas beyond a marine league from the shore of any State, or the District of Columbia, or the Territories or dependencies of the United States, the personal representative of the decedent may maintain a suit for damages in the district courts of the United States, in admiralty, for the exclusive benefit of the decedent's wife, husband, parent, child, or dependent relative against the vessel, person, or corporation which would have been liable if death had not ensued."

"§ 764. Right of action given by laws of foreign countries—Whenever a right of action is granted by the law of any foreign State on account of death by wrongful act, neglect, or default occurring upon the high seas, such right may be maintained in an appropriate action in admiralty in the courts of the United States without abatement in respect to the amount for which recovery is authorized, any statute of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding."

What we have said above with respect to the sufficiency of the proof of negligence and of the proximate cause of the fire makes it necessary that on Verbeecks' appeal from the decree dismissing their libel against Black Diamond the cause be remanded for findings on those questions.[11]

The Appeals From the Decree Exonerating Skibs A/S Jolund

The decree granting exoneration to the owner of the vessel is challenged by three groups of appellants: the cargo owners, the seven passenger appellants, and the Verbeecks.

As for the cargo owners, the controlling enactment is the Fire Statute, Title 46 U. S. C. § 182,[12] which provides the owner exemption from liability for loss to cargo by fire "unless such fire is caused by the design or neglect of such owner." These appellants assert that such "design or neglect" was established here by proof that one Capt. Svendsen was a managing officer representing the owners and whose scope of authority included supervision over the phase of business out of which the loss or injury occurred, within the meaning of *Coryell* v. *Phipps, supra.* The owner was a Norwegian corporation and all matters pertaining to the management and maintenance of the vessel were in the hands of Sigurd Herlofsen & Co., also a Norwegian corporation, as manager for the owner. As the court found,

---

[11] We are not required by this record to pass upon the question whether, as concerns Verbeecks' case against Black Diamond, the latter might be chargeable with negligence on the part of the ship's officers in failing to prevent smoking by passengers.

[12] "§ 182. Loss by fire. No owner of any vessel shall be liable to answer for or make good to any person any loss or damage, which may happen to any merchandise whatsoever, which shall be shipped, taken in, or put on board any such vessel, by reason or by means of any fire happening to or on board the vessel, unless such fire is caused by the design or neglect of such owner."

the entire management of the ship was entrusted to the latter corporation. Capt. Svendsen was employed by Sigurd Herlofsen & Co. He states in his deposition that he became head of the Marine Department of Sigurd Herlofsen & Co. on January 6, 1954; but in June and July, 1952, when the fire occurred, he had not been appointed to this position. In response to an inquiry as to where he was then employed by the employing corporation, he replied, "I was in the Marine Department in the office in Oslo." At that time the head of the Marine Department was a Captain Wellton. Capt. Svendsen testified: "I just had the work given to me by Capt. Wellton. For instance, I might be sent out on a ship as a captain, or anything that he thought he needed me for." He said that he knew that ships under charter to Black Diamond carried cargoes of naphthalene in that fashion; but he had never discussed with any officer of Sigurd Herlofsen & Co. the manner of stowage on the Black Gull or any other vessel chartered to Black Diamond.

The only finding made by the trial court concerning Capt. Svendsen was its finding No. 70 as follows: "At and before the time of the voyage here involved, it was personally known to Capt. Inge Svendsen, who assisted the head of the Marine Department of S. Herlofsen & Co., which managed the 'Black Gull' for petitioner, that respondent customarily carried bagged naphthalene on deck on vessels which it chartered from petitioner, covered only by manila rope netting." No doubt, because of its findings that there was lack of proof of causation of the fire, the trial court considered it unnecessary to make a specific finding as to whether Capt. Svendsen was an executive officer, manager or agent.

In the case of *Consumers Company* v. *Kabushiki Kaisha*, 320 U. S. 249, the negligence to which the loss of cargo by fire was attributable, was that of one Captain Fagen who had been employed to supervise stowage on the ship in question. (The facts were discussed at length when the

case was in this court, 133 F. 2d 781.) But in that case the trial court had found that Captain Fagen's "authority, however, was limited to supervision of meal stowage for the K Line at Kobe and to the giving of instructions to the masters with reference to such stowage. He was not a marine superintendent, general agent or managing officer of the K Line." *The Venice Maru*, 39 F. Supp. 349, 352.

While the court below might well upon the record here have made a similar finding with respect to Capt. Svendsen, it did not do so. The court's conclusion of law No. 7 was as follows: "The fire was not caused by the design or neglect of the petitioner and the Fire Statute is a complete defense as to all claims for cargo loss or damage." This conclusion appears to be based upon the trial court's findings that there was no proof that the fire was caused by any neglect or negligence whatever. Admiralty Rule 46½ contemplates that the findings of fact and the conclusions of law shall be stated separately.[13] If the court intended its conclusion No. 7 to be a finding of fact that the representative of the owner charged with negligence was not of managerial rank, it did not say so. The conclusion, as worded, is susceptible of interpretation as having been predicated solely on findings of a lack of causation.

For reasons previously stated in discussing the question of Black Diamond's liability, we hold that there was evidence from which the court might have found that the fire was caused by negligence in the manner of stowage of naphthalene and the failure to cover it. Should the court find, as did the court in *The Venice Maru, supra*, that Capt. Svendsen was not a general agent or managing officer, then the owner will be entitled to exoneration as against the cargo owners. Should the court find that Capt. Svendsen was a managing agent, then the court must determine whether any neglect or failure to act on his part constituted

---

[13] "In deciding cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction the court of first instance shall find the facts specially and state separately its conclusions of law thereon; * * *"

negligence, and if so, whether the same was a proximate cause of the loss.

With respect to the claims of passenger-appellants, the Fire Statute is inapplicable as it concerns loss or damage to merchandise only. The passengers are entitled to the benefit of the rule stated in Title 46 U. S. C. §183(e) as follows: "In respect of loss of life or bodily injury the privity or knowledge of the master of a seagoing vessel or of the superintendent or managing agent of the owner thereof, at or prior to the commencement of each voyage, shall be deemed conclusively the privity or knowledge of the Owner of such vessel."

Since 1949 the Captain had been acquainted with the American Coast Guard regulations and knew that they required that naphthalene when carried on deck should be covered. As one acquainted with the regulations he should have known that they classified naphthalene as a dangerous cargo.

As for the claim of Verbeecks against the owners, it is plain that they also are entitled to the benefits of §183(e) quoted above. The owner, differing from Black Diamond,[14] is entitled to the benefits of the Limitation of Liability Act, 46 U. S. C. §183, as against a claimant under the Death on the High Seas Act (*In Re Wood's petition* (2 Cir.), 239 F. 2d 197), which contains special provisions relating to claims for loss of life or bodily injury.

In view of what we have said heretofore concerning the claims of the passengers and the issues in the action of the Verbeecks against Black Diamond, it is apparent that the cause must be remanded for further findings respecting the issues as between the Verbeecks and Skibs A/S Jolund.

The decrees are reversed and the cause is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

---

[14] Which is not an "owner" within the meaning of the Act, Gilmore and Black, The Law of Admiralty, 1957, p. 673; Benedict, The Law of American Admiralty, 6th ed., §497.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

On Petitions for Rehearing

(Decided January 16, 1958)

POPE, *Circuit Judge:*

Upon petitions for rehearing appellees assert that our opinion is in error in stating that there was no evidence to support the trial judge's theory, based on Exhibit 38, that naphthalene "permeates tarpaulins and hatch boards," and that "the creosote oil and gases could impregnate the tarpaulin and thereby make the tarpaulin as inflammable as the impregnated bagging."[1] Appellees say there is credible uncontradicted evidence that the gases and oils would impregnate or saturate a tarpaulin and "make it as inflammable as the impregnated bagging."

Our opinion makes plain why we think the trial court misunderstood or misinterpreted Exhibit 38, and why we consider the findings drawn therefrom clearly erroneous. As for the contention of the petitions that there was other evidence to support the judge's view of Exhibit 38, we cannot so read the record. The witnesses whose testimony is listed by petitioners carefully avoided saying any such thing.[2] One said that *if* a tarpaulin became impregnated

---

[1] "The Judge's theory, there disclosed, is that if the stow had been covered by a tarpaulin, the gases and the creosote oil given off by the crude naphthalene would have impregnated the tarpaulin or saturated it and made it as inflammable as the impregnated bagging. There is no such evidence in the record."

[2] Thus Black Diamond quotes Captain Hollaar's testimony as follows:

> "Q Captain Hollaar, it has been suggested by Mr. Longley if the tarpaulin were put over the stow of naphthalene it would become, to use his words, permeated with naphthalene.

with *naphthalene* it would become inflammable. Others said if tarpaulins were used for cover they would be impregnated with the "odor" or "smell" of naphthalene. No testimony supported the court's theory, mistakenly deduced from Exhibit 38, that use of a tarpaulin as a cover would "*make the tarpaulin as inflammable as the impregnated bagging.*" The trial court's theory was dependent upon this "as inflammable." If, as Capt. Hollaar testified, a cigarette or cigar butt "would be much less likely to ignite the stow if it were covered by tarpaulin than if the stow were uncovered," then the theory of lack of causation falls to the ground.

Again petitioners challenge our statement that the trial judge's opinion described the deck temperature as "in excess of 120° F." It says this was a mere recital of libelant's argument. We do not so read the judge's opinion. The finding as to bridge temperatures, in the shade, was irrelevant. The evidence in the record shows that the 120° F. which the judge took as being accurate, was in fact so. It was arrived at by adding to the 77° bridge temperature the 43° difference which Dr. Purdy testified would exist in the higher temperature on deck.

As for the petitions' statement that we misread the Coast Guard regulations as requiring tarpaulin covers, reference

---

Captain, in your opinion, would a tarpaulin which had become permeated with naphthalene be about as inflammable, more inflammable or less inflammable, than burlap bags? A. Well, if it had become permeated with naphthalene of course it would be in practically the same condition as the jute bags."

(On recross examination): "Q. Captain, are you seriously telling us as an experienced mariner that a tarpaulin is as readily ignitable as a burlap bag? A. If it was impregnated with naphthalene, I do not see any difference."

Thus the Captain carefully says: *If* the tarpaulin was impregnated with naphthalene it would be inflammable. No word from him says that a tarpaulin used to *cover* such a stow *would* become impregnated; much less that it would, as the judge seemed to think, become "as inflammable as the impregnated bagging."

to the opinion will show we did not say that. In footnote 4 we listed the alternative "Required Conditions for Transportation." One of these is "on deck protected.' Regulation 146.27-6 provides that this condition may be satisfied by the use of "structural erections, awnings, or tarpaulins." by underscoring the word "may" in the last sentence, petitioners argue this means such protections are merely permissive. This ignores the words "Required Conditions," and ignores the words "shall be protected" in Regulation 146.03-34(b) quoted in the opinion. But this is all beside the point. Lioelants contended that the naphthalene might have been protected by covering with tarpaulin. Petitioners concede that the regulations say "hazardous articles *may* be protected by the use of a tarpaulin." The judge's findings was that the naphthalene *could not possibly* have been protected by such means. It is with this that we have mainly found fault.

As for the contention that the Dutch regulations, or portions thereof, were not in effect because not published, for our purposes it is of no consequence whether the Dutch regulations shown in the record had the force of Dutch law or not. Plainly they were drafted by officials who presumably knew their business. Our mention of them has not been for the purpose of disclosing any violation of any regulation having the force of law. Our reference was merely to show that like the Coast Guard regulations they represent an accepted standard of care.

The petitions for rehearing are denied.